



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,554	11/20/2003	Kuang-Chih Lai	FP9740	5685
7590	12/10/2004		EXAMINER LUEBKE, RENEE S	
Leong C. LEI PMB#1008 1867 Ygnacio Valley Rd. Walnut Creek, CA 94598-3214			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/716,554

Applicant(s)

LAI

Examiner

Renee S. Luebke

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 7-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2833

1. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification and abstract are replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The application should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is suggested. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Two of the patents listed on page 2 of the specification (4232372 and 5289819) do not appear to relate to the present invention.
- The use of "fifth," "ninth" and "fourteenth" embodiment on lines 6-10 of page 5 does not agree with the remainder of the application.
- The term "mosaic" in regard to part 57 appears misleading. How is this member seen to be or resemble a mosaic?
- The term "momentum" in regard to part 58 is confusing. How does this term properly describe the member?
- On line 19 of page 7, it appears that "472" should be -572-.

Appropriate corrections are required.

3. Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. To what do "each" and "its" on lines 2 and 3 of claim 1 refer?
- b. The meaning of "so to conduct where between" on line 4 of claim 1 is unclear.
- c. On lines 11 and 19 of claim 1, it appears that "ID" should be -IC-.
- d. Contrary to line 19 of claim 1 (and in the specification), the adjacent terminals are not "abutted" since they do not contact one another.

Art Unit: 2833

e. To what does "local" refer in claim 2 (and the specification)? What is the position "local" to?

f. Claims 7-9 contradict claim 1 from which they depend. Claim 1 requires that upper and lower momentum parts be similarly elongated. However, claims 7-9 require a soldering part. The disclosure does not include an embodiment where both of these features are present.

g. Claims 8 and 9 lack antecedent basis for "the soldering part" on line 2.

h. In general, the claims are written in non-standard English and are confusing.

Appropriate corrections are required.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeFord, et al. in view of Maldonado, et al. The conduction member 18 of DeFord is embedded in an insulation plate 12 and comprises a mosaic part 26 and a first momentum part 28. The projected length of the momentum part, 1.125mm, is greater than the spacing between adjacent terminals, 1.09 mm and 1.17mm. This device lacks a second momentum part with similar proportions. However, Maldonado teaches the use of terminals having two momentum parts of equal length. This arrangement allows the terminals to be inserted without regard to direction. For the same reason, it would have been obvious to include terminals with two momentum parts of the same length in the device of DeFord.

Art Unit: 2833

In regard to claim 2, Maldonado teaches the use of a projection, at midsection 56. Such an arrangement assists in securing the terminal in the plate. For the same reason, it would have been obvious to include a protrusion on the mosaic part of DeFord.

6. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeFord and Maldonado as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ochiai. The similar device of Ochiai comprises momentum parts 11 with slots 25 and protruded contactors 27. This arrangement allows for redundancy and better connections. For the same reasons, it would have been obvious to include split momentum parts on the device of DeFord as taught by Ochiai.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Walkup, et al. comprises momentum parts that are proportioned similarly to those of the present invention. Koopman, et al. includes a flap to assist securement in the plate.

8. Any response to this action may be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:
(703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2833

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Mrs. Renee Luebke whose telephone number is (571) 272-2009.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Paula Bradley, can be reached at (571) 272-2800, extension 33.



Renee S. Luebke
Primary Patent Examiner
December 6, 2004